

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In complete response to the Final Office Action dated August 10, 2006, on the above identified application, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 18, 20-39, 42, and 46-51 are pending in this application.

With this amendment, claim 39 is amended.

Claim 39 has been amended to correct the spelling of the word "phosphorus", which had incorrectly been spelled "phosphorous".

Applicant notes that the Examiner mentioned in the "Response to Arguments" section of the latest Office Action that "Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection." Applicant respectfully points out that the rejections that were made in the latest Office Action (mailing date 8/10/2006) are identical to the rejections that were made in the prior Office Action (mailing date 2/22/2006) with the exception of one additional set of 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections. Hence, Applicants believe that this "Response to Arguments" is improper as it provides no guidance to Applicants regarding the real merits of their past arguments.

Hence, the Applicant is confused as to both the nature of this action (final or non-final) and the status of the prior arguments. Hence, since the rejections remain identical to the prior rejections, Applicant re-submits the prior arguments with the hope that they will be fully considered again.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 18, and 20-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Quaas et al. '017. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 and 20-34 are not anticipated by Quaas et al. '017.

The Examiner notes that Quaas et al. '017 "discloses welding which uses a copper based alloy that also contains tin (4-25%) and phosphorous (0.1-1%), the balance being copper." Thus, Quaas et al. '017 discloses a *single* welding alloy that contains copper, tin and phosphorous. Applicants respectfully point out that this is entirely different than what is required in claim 18 of the instant application.

Claim 18 of the instant application requires two separate operations, the first being a brazing operation and the second being a simple deposition of a layer of alloy. The brazing operation establishes a matrix, and the second step comprises "depositing at least one layer of an alloy onto" this matrix. These two steps are a process for *preparing* the workpiece for subsequent welding. Claim 18 does not require any welding to take place.

Claim 18 of the instant application requires that the brazing operation (i.e., the matrix) comprise copper and phosphorous. Claim 18 requires that the layering alloy comprise copper and at least 1.0% tin by weight. These are two different compositions, for two different layers, made by two different processes. The matrix is produced by brazing. The layered alloy "supplied in the form of a meltable wire, which is melted by using an electric arc, in particular by means of an MIG torch" (*instant specification, page 9, line 39 – page 10, line 2*).

The process required by claim 18 of the instant application is best understood by referencing Fig. 1. The brazed zone, comprising copper and phosphorous, is indicated as element 3. The layering alloy, comprising copper and at least 1.0% tin by weight, is indicated by elements 5, 6, and 7. The future weld (not within the scope of claim 18) is indicated by element 4. Elements 1 and 2 are the two workpieces that are being welded together.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art of welding, that Quaas et al. '017, in disclosing single low melting copper base welding alloys, fails to disclose all the elements of claim 18 of the instant application. Thus the § 102 rejection is unsupported and should be withdrawn. As claims 20 – 34 are dependent upon claim 18, these rejections, as pertains to these claims, are likewise unsupported.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 35 – 38, and 50, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quaas et al. '017 in view of Davidian et al. '662.

As discussed above, claim 18 of the instant application requires elements that are not present in Quaas et al. '017 and are likewise not disclosed in Davidian et al. '662. These same missing features are also present in claim 50 of the instant application. Therefore, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn. As claims 35 - 38 are dependent upon claim 18, these rejections, as pertains to these claims, are likewise moot.

Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidian et al. '662 in view of Quaas et al. '017.

The features discussed above with reference to claim 18 of the instant application requires elements that are not present in Davidian et al. '682, and are likewise not disclosed in Quaas et al. '017, are also present in claim 39 of the instant application. Therefore, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn. As claim 46 is dependent upon claim 39, this rejection, as pertains to this claim, is likewise moot.

Claims 39, 42, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Davidian et al. '662 in view of either Quaas et al. '017 or Clarke '618 or Harris '717.

The features discussed above with reference to claim 18 of the instant application requires elements that are not present in Davidian et al. '682, and are likewise not disclosed in Quaas et al. '017, Clarke '618 or Harris '717 , are also present in claim 39 of the instant application. Therefore, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn. As claim 42 is dependent upon claim 39, this rejection, as pertains to this claim, is likewise moot. As claim 47 is ultimately dependent upon claim 18, this rejection, as pertains to this claim, is likewise moot.

Appl. No. 10/628,153
Attorney Docket No. Serie 6034
Amdt. dated September 28, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of August 10, 2006

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Elwood Haynes, Reg. No. 55,254

Date: **September 28, 2006**

Air Liquide
2700 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1800
Houston, Texas 77056
Phone: (713) 624-8954
Fax: (713) 624-8950